

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

In response to the Office Action dated July 19, 2007, claims 1, 7 and 8 have been amended. Claims 1-8 are now pending in this application. No new matter has been added.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

I. Claims 1 and 3-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara et al. (U.S. 2002/0178304) in view of Gennetten et al. (US 2004/0201680).

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner admits that Camara et al. does not disclose that image sending apparatus (224) comprises an image selecting device which selects a desired image of images recorded on the recording medium, or that the first communication device (of image sending apparatus 224) sends an image capturing command to the external device. The Examiner further notes that Camara et al. do not disclose a transfer function device (of the image sending apparatus 224), an automatic mode switching device (in the image sending apparatus 224) and that the mode switch control device (of the image receiving apparatus 250) sends a conversion command (to the image sending apparatus 224) to change the communication mode to the first communication mode in order to transfer images.

The Examiner maintains that the above features are disclosed in Gennetten et al. In particular, the Examiner that the docking device of Gennetten et al. has “an automatic mode switching device which automatically switches between the first communication mode and the second communication mode in the first communication device (The camera is automatically switched between a regular camera mode (i.e., a second communication mode) and a picture transfer mode (i.e., first communication mode) as the external device “hijacks” the user interface of the camera when connected”.

However, the regular camera mode cannot be reasonably interpreted as a communication mode of the camera. More specifically, reverting to normal camera behavior upon undocking of the camera from the docking device does not include any communication mode for communicating images to or from the camera. While this is believed to be implicit in the second communication mode, independent claims 1 and 7 have been amended to delineate, *inter alia*:

a second communication mode for enabling the image sending device to function as an external recording device by receiving and recording images transferred from the external device;

Independent claim 8 has been amended to delineate, *inter alia*:

a communication device which has a first communication mode capable of, on receiving from an image sending apparatus an image capturing command of a desired image of images recorded on a recording medium in the image sending apparatus, capturing the image in the image receiving apparatus according to the received command and has a second communication mode enabling images to be sent to the image sending device for storage therein;

To the list of missing features of Camara et al., Applicant add that there is nothing disclosed in Camara et al. regarding the MSC 224 *checking* that there has been the transfer instruction of the image from the user component 250, and if not, sending a

conversion command to the user component 250. In this regard, the Examiner contends that in Gennetten et al., the camera is automatically switched between a regular camera mode (i.e., a second communication mode) and a picture transfer mode (i.e., first communication mode) as the external device “hijacks” the user interface of the camera when connected. However, such automatic switching between a regular camera mode (i.e., a second communication mode) and a picture transfer mode (i.e., first communication mode) as the external device “hijacks” the user interface of the camera when connected cannot reasonably be interpreted as corresponding to what is recited in, for example, claim 8, which requires:

on checking that there has been a transfer instruction from the image sending apparatus through the communication device, the mode switch control device determines whether or not the communication mode with the image sending apparatus is the first communication mode, and sends a conversion command for ordering change to the first communication mode if determined that a current communication mode of the image sending apparatus is not the first communication mode.

More specifically, in Gennetten et al., there is no *checking* that there has been a transfer instruction from the image sending apparatus through the communication device in order to send a conversion command when the mode switch control device determines that the communication mode with the camera is not the first communication mode. The camera of Gennetten et al. is disclosed as *automatically entering* what the Examiner contends is *the first communication mode immediately upon connecting the camera to the docking device*. This is clearly different from what is recited in, for example, independent claim 8.

What is disclosed in Gennetten et al. is also different from what is recited in independent claims 1 and 7. More specifically, in Gennetten et al. there is no *checking*

that the transfer instruction of the image from the transfer instruction device as a prelude to determining whether or not the communication mode with the image sending apparatus is the first communication mode so that the conversion command for ordering change to the first communication mode can be sent if it is determined that a current communication mode of the image sending apparatus is not the first communication mode.

In view of the above, claims 1 and 3-8, as amended, are patentable over Camara et al. and Gennetten et al. and their allowance is respectfully solicited.

II. Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara et al. in view of Gennetten et al., as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Takahashi (USPN 6,867,882).

Takahashi does not remedy the above noted deficiencies of Camara et al. and Gennetten et al. and claim 2 depends directly from amended independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 2 is patentable over Camara et al. and Gennetten et al., even when considered in view of Takahashi, and its allowance is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Edward J. Wise (Reg. No. 34,523) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Date: November 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Marc S. Weiner

Registration No.: 32,181

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

Attorney for Applicant